

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 08708 01 OF 04 081532Z

50

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 039050

R 081521Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6402

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 04 OECD PARIS 08708

EXCON

E.O. 11652: XGDS1

TAGS: ESTC, COCOM

SUBJECT: COCOM LIST REVIEW - IL 1529 - INSTRUMENTS

REF: A. COCOM DOC REV(74) 1529/2

B. REVISION OF COCOM DOC REV(74) 1529/2

C. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS IN COCOM DOC REV(74) 1529/5

D. COCOM DOC REV(74) 1529/5

E. COCOM DOC REV(74) 1529/W.P.1

F. COCOM DOC REV(74) 1529/4

SUMMARY: DISCUSSION OF THIS ITEM WAS HIGHLY TECHNICAL AND RESULTED IN LITTLE AGREEMENT. THE UK REVISED ITS PROPOSAL ON SUB-ITEM (A) DURING THE DISCUSSIONS BUT FINAL ADOPTION WAS NOT YET REALIZED. THE US COUNTERPROPOSAL ON SUB-ITEM (B) RECEIVED SUPPORT IN SOME AREAS BUT REQUIRES EXTENSIVE REWORK IN OTHER AREAS. OUR COUNTERPROPOSAL ON (D) RECEIVED LITTLE SUPPORT WITH MOST DELEGATES PREFERRING THE UK VERSION. SUB-ITEM (E) WAS MORE ACCEPTABLE TO MOST DELEGATIONS THAN THE PRESENT DEFINITION. NOTES 1,3 AND 4 WERE ACCEPTED BY THE MAJORITY OF DELEGATES AND NOTE 2 RECEIVED A US OBJECTION. ACTION REQUESTED: REWORK OUR COUNTERPROPOSAL TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION THE COMMENTS OF OTHER DELEGATIONS. END SUMMARY.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 08708 01 OF 04 081532Z

1. THE UK REVISED PROPOSAL FOR SUB-ITEM (A) OF IL 1529

(REF. A) WAS DISCUSSED ON APRIL 1 AND MET WITH UNIVERSAL RESISTANCE FOR VARYING REASONS. THE GERMANS THOUGHT THAT IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT FOR CUSTOMS OFFICIALS TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN THE VARIOUS TYPES OF EQUIPMENT LISTED. THEY PREFERRED THEIR OWN PROPOSAL WHICH SIMPLY EMBARGOED ALL TYPES OF ATOMIC FREQUENCY STANDARDS.

2. THE US RESERVED ON SUB-ITEM (A) (I) PREFERRING A LEVEL OF 5 PARTS IN 10 TO THE 10TH. AFTER SOME DISCUSSION ON EXACTLY WHAT TYPES OF EQUIPMENTS WERE ENVISAGED FOR EACH SUB-ITEM US EXPERTS INDICATED A WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER 1 PART IN 10 TO THE 10TH FOR REFERENCE FREQUENCY STANDARDS ONLY AND NOT GENERAL PURPOSE OSCILLATORS USED AS PART OF OTHER EQUIPMENTS.

3. THE FRENCH RESERVED ON SUB-ITEMS (A) (II) CLAIMING THEIR MILITARY HAD STRATEGIC CONCERNS FOR THE LEVEL OF 1 PART IN 10 TO THE 8TH. THEY ALSO RESERVED ON (A)(III) STATING THIS TYPE OF EQUIPMENT DID NOT EXIST. THEY WERE SUPPORTED ON THIS POINT BY THE GERMANS, NETHERLANDS AND CANADIAN DELEGATIONS. THE US STATED THEY COULD AGREE TO DELETING THIS TYPE EQUIPMENT IF A NOTE CROSS-REFERENCING IL 1587 FOR TCXO OSCILLATORS WAS INCLUDED.

4. ITALY FOLLOWED THE MAJORITY AND JAPAN ACCEPTED THE ENTIRE UK PROPOSAL. BECAUSE OF THE UNENTHUSIASTIC RESPONSE, THE UK STATED THEY WOULD REDRAFT THIS PROPOSAL AND SUBMIT IT FOR DISCUSSION THE FOLLOWING DAY.

5. THE GERMAN PROPOSAL ON SUB-ITEM (A) WAS DISCUSSED AND RECEIVED A COOL RECEPTION FROM MOST DELEGATIONS. IT WAS ACCEPTED BY THE JAPANESE WHILE THE NETHERLANDS, US UK AND CANADIAN DELEGATIONS RESERVED.

6. THE REVISED UK PROPOSAL (REF. B) DISCUSSED ON 2 APRIL 1975 AND CANADA, JAPAN, ITALY, GERMANY AND THE NETHERLANDS ACCEPTED. THE US ACCEPTED THE PROPOSAL (AMENDED TO READ "OVER 24 HOURS OR MORE" IN (A)(I)) BEING IN AN AD. REF. POSITION ON (A)(I). THE FRENCH WERE UNABLE TO ACCEPT (A)(III) AND THE NOTE FOR REASONS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 OECD P 08708 01 OF 04 081532Z

WHICH WERE UNDECIPHERABLE. THEIR RESERVE ON THE NOTE WAS SYMPATHETIC BUT THEY REFERRED THE COMMITTEE TO THEIR REMARKS IN COCOM DOC.(71) 1587/7 CONCERNING TCXO'S.

7. THE FRENCH STATED THEY COULD ACCEPT (A)(III) IF THE WORD "OR" BETWEEN "STABILITY" AND ACCURACY "WAS REPLACED BY "AND". THE UK STATED THEY WOULD NOT OBJECT IF THE WORDS "AND/OR" WERE USED. THE FRENCH WERE NOT RECEPTIVE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 08708 02 OF 04 081540Z

50

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 039192

R 081521Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6403

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 04 OECD PARIS 08708

EXCON

TO THIS SUGGESTION. A LENGTHY DISCUSSION ENSUED BETWEEN UK AND FRENCH EXPERTS WHICH LEFT THE ENTIRE MATTER UN-RESOLVED.

8. THE US SUBMITTED ITS COUNTERPROPOSAL ON SUB-ITEM (6) AND THE UK AND GERMAN DELEGATIONS AGREED TO CONTINUE DISCUSSING 1529 BASED UPON THIS UK PROPOSAL RATHER THAN THEIR OWN. THE HEADING AND SUB-ITEM (B)(1) WERE ACCEPTED BY ALL DELEGATIONS HOWEVER THE UK, JAPAN AND ITALY REGISTERED GENERAL RESERVES ON THE ENTIRE PROPOSAL SINCE THEY WANTED MORE TIME TO STUDY IT CAREFULLY.

9. PRESENTATION OF THE US COUNTERPROPOSAL TOOK PLACE LATE IN THE DAY OF APRIL 1 AND MANY DELEGATIONS RAISED QUESTIONS ON THE TYPES OF EQUIPMENTS LISTED THEREIN. BECAUSE OF THESE QUESTIONS, US EXPERTS PRESENTED A LIST OF DEFINITIONS FOR THE TERMS MENTIONED IN THE PROPOSAL BEFORE DISCUSSIONS BEGAN ON APRIL 2 (REF.C).

10. THE US PROPOSAL FOR (B)(2) WAS ACCEPTED BY JAPAN, GERMANY AND THE NETHERLANDS. ITALY AND CANADA ACCEPTED THE HEADING AND WISHED TO STUDY THE THREE SUB-ITEMS. THE UK AND FRENCH DELEGATIONS ACCEPTED AD. REF. THE HEADING AND SUB-ITEMS (II) AND (III). THE FRENCH

QUERIED WHETHER SPECTRUM GENERATORS OF NON-HARMONICALLY
RELATED FREQUENCIES WOULD FALL UNDER (I). THE US STATED
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 08708 02 OF 04 081540Z

IT WOULD REFER THIS QUESTION TO ITS AUTHORITIES AND
FRANCE RESERVED ON (B)(2)(I). THE UK ASKED WHAT FRE-
QUENCY SPACING WAS ENVISAGED FOR COMB GENERATORS AND THE
US TEAM OFFERED TO DETERMINE THIS PRIOR TO ROUND III.
FYI-SUB-ITEM B (B)(2)(I) IF DEFINED MORE PRECISELY WOULD
BE ACCEPTABLE TO ALL DELEGATIONS.

LL. OUR PROPOSAL ON SUB-ITEM (B)(3) RECEIVED LITTLE
SUPPORT. MOST OF THE CRITICISM RESULTED FROM THE
BROAD DEFINITIONS WE USED TO DESCRIBE THE INSTRUMENTS
FOR WHICH WE WERE CONCERNED. DELEGATIONS COULD AGREE TO
THE GENERAL HEADING FOR (B)(3) AND THE 1GHZ LEVEL BUT
MOST EXPRESSED A DESIRE FOR 2GHZ OR 3GHZ LEVELS FOR SOME
OF THE EQUIPMENT LISTED THEREIN. EVEN THOUGH (B)(3)(I)
IS VIRTUALLY THE SAME AS (B)(3)(IV) IN THE PRESENT ITEM,
MANY DELEGATIONS WERE UNAWARE OF THIS TYPE EQUIPMENT AND
THOUGHT IT INCLUDED TV TEST ANALYZERS. A BETTER DE-
FINITION DESCRIBING THOSE NETWORK ANALYZERS ABOUT WHICH
WE ARE CONCERNED WOULD BE ADVISABLE IF THE 1GHZ LEVEL IS
TO BE ACCEPTABLE.

12. SUB-ITEM (B)(3)(II) WAS ANOTHER CASE OF THE DEFI-
NITION BEING TOO BROAD SO AS TO EMBARGO INNOCUOUS
EQUIPMENT. THE GERMANS POINTED OUT THAT AMPLITUDE RE-
CEIVERS HAVE BE MANUFACTURED FOR MANY YEARS AND WOULD
BECOME EMBARGOED IF THIS ITEM ACCEPTED. FYI-PERHAPS
PARAMETERS FOR THE TYPES OF EQUIPMENT WE WANT COVERED
HERE. DATA SHEETS PRESENTED ON THIS TYPE OF EQUIPMENT
SEEMED TO RECEIVE AGREEMENT OF MOST DELEGATIONS THAT IT
SHOULD BE COVERED.

L3. THE UK, CANADA, AND ITALY WANTED SUB-ITEM (B)(3)
(III) EQUIPMENT RELEASED UP TO 3GHZ. THE UK ASKED THE
US TO DROP IMPEDANCE METERS FROM (III) CLAIMING THESE
INSTRUMENTS ARE NOT SOPHISTICATED. HERE AGAIN THE
UK SUGGESTED INTRODUCING PARAMETERS TO DESCRIBE THAT
TYPE OF EQUIPMENT WE WANT EMBARGOED.

14. SUB-ITEM (B)(3)(IV) WAS ACCEPTED BY THE GERMAN,
NETHERLANDS, CANADA AND ITALY DELEGATIONS. THE UK AND
FRANCE ACCEPTED AD. REF. JAPAN RESERVED ON ALL OF SUB-
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 OECD P 08708 02 OF 04 081540Z

ITEM (B)(3) CLAIMING IT WAS ALL TOO GENERAL AND VAGUE.

15. SUB-ITEM (B)(4) WAS IDENTICAL TO THE UK PROPOSAL WHICH WAS NOT TOO DIFFERENT FROM THE PRESENT DEFINITION. ALL DELEGATIONS ACCEPTED THE FRENCH AND JAPANESE AD.REF.

16. SUB-ITEM (B)(5) IS AN EXTENSION OF THE EMBARGO TO INCLUDE ALL INSTRUMENTS CONTAINING MICROPROCESSORS. THIS SUB-ITEM MET WITH HEAVY RESISTANCE MOST OF WHICH WAS BASED ON THE PROBLEM OF DEFINING A MICROPROCESSOR. THE UK SUGGESTED THE POSSIBILITY OF MAKING A LIST OF EXCLUSIONS (SIMILAR TO THE IL 1564, NOTE 6 PROCEDURE) TO RELEASE SIMPLE TV AND AUTOMOBILE SERVICING EQUIPMENT WHICH MIGHT IN THE FUTURE CONTAIN MICROPROCESSORS.

17. THE NETHERLANDS WANTED TO PLACE CATEGORIES OF EQUIPMENT ON SUCH AN EXCLUSION LIST WHILE THE UK THROUGH

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 08708 03 OF 04 081538Z

50

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 039125

R 081521Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6404

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 03 OF 04 OECD PARIS 08708

EXCON

SPECIFIC TYPES SHOULD BE LISTED. MOST DELEGATIONS SYMPATHIZED WITH THE UK SUGGESTION. FYI-THIS IS ONE OF THE MORE IMPORTANT ITEMS WHICH SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE IL, ALBEIT EQUIPMENT OF THIS NATURE IS ONLY BEGINNING TO APPEAR ON THE MARKET. THE SYMPATHETIC RECEPTION SHOULD BE FOLLOWED UP WITH A CONCERTED EFFORT TO ALLEVIATE THE

PROBLEMS CITED ABOVE IF ITS ADDITION TO THE IL IS TO BE
ACHEIVED.

18. THE NETHERLANDS THROUGH (B)(5) EQUIPMENT WOULD BE
COVERED BY 1564 AND/OR 1565. WE EXPLAINED THAT THIS IS
DOUBTFUL BUT WE WOULD INVESTIGATE. THE FRENCH POINTED
OUT THAT IN THE LAST LIST REVIEW THE US WANTED TO EMBARGO
AUTOMATIC EQUIPMENT CONTAINING A CALCULATOR, BUT HAD
NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY OTHER DELEGATIONS.

19. OUR PROPOSAL FOR SUB-ITEM (B)(6) RECEIVED UNANIMOUS
RESERVES BASED UPON THE LEGITIMATE CLAIM THAT THE DEFINITION
WAS TOO BROAD. THE UK ASKED WHETHER WE
COULD AGREE TO SPECIFYING A MINIMUM 1GHZ LEVEL. WE
UNDERTOOK TO STUDY SUCH A PROPOSAL SYMPATHETICALLY.

20. THE UK EXPRESSED THE DESIRE TO LEAVE THEIR PROPOSAL
FOR (B) PENDING BUT DID NOT WISH TO DISCUSS IT DURING
THIS ROUND. THE GERMAN DELEGATION EXPRESSED THE SAME
DESIRE AND BOTH PROPOSALS REMAIN PENDING.
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 08708 03 OF 04 081538Z

21. THE US PRESENTED ITS COUNTERPROPOSAL FOR SUB-ITEM
(D) CLAIMING IT ACHIEVED WHAT IT THOUGHT WAS THE UK INTENT.
THE GERMAN EXPERT EXPLAINED TO INTENT OF THE UK
PROPOSAL WAS TO DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN THOSE INSTRUMENTS
CAPABLE OF DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN RANDOM SIGNALS (PULSES)
AND CONTINUOUS WAVE SIGNALS, SUCH AS SINUSOIDAL WAVES.
A COUNTER WHICH CAN COUNT CERTAIN FREQUENCIES OF SINUSOIDAL
WAVES IS NOT ABLE TO COUNT PULSED WAVES AT DIFFERENT
FREQUENCIES. A COUNTER FOR CW ISN'T THE SAME AS
ARE FOR RANDOM PULSES. IT CAN BE 5 TIMES GREATER THAN
RANDOM PULSES. FOR THESE REASONS THE GERMANS PREFERRED
THE UK PROPOSAL.

22. THE US EXPERTS PRESSED BOTH GERMANY AND THE UK
FOR BROCHURES ON THESE TYPE COUNTERS AND AN EXPLANATION
AS TO HOW THEY DIFFERENTIATE BETWEEN THE TWO TYPES.
BOTH DELEGATIONS EXPRESSED DISMAY AT NOT BEING ASKED
THIS DURING ROUND I BUT WOULD TRY TO DEVELOP THIS INFORMATION
NOW.

23. THE DISCUSSION MOVED TO THE UK PROPOSAL ON SUB-ITEM
(D) AS CONTAINED IN REFERENCE E. ALL DELEGATIONS ACCEPTED
THIS PROPOSAL EXCEPT THE US WHICH RESERVED PREFERRING
ITS OWN COUNTERPROPOSAL. THE GERMAN EXPERT FURTHER
EXPLAINED THAT THIS ITEM FROM THE BEGINNING WAS
DIRECTED AT NUCLEAR COUNTING EQUIPMENT, NOT COMMUNICATIONS
COUNTERS. EVERY UNIVERSAL COUNTER CAN COUNT

IRREGULAR PULSES BUT THERE ARE MANY SPECIAL ONES WHICH
CAN GO HIGHER.

24. DISCUSSION REVERTED TO THE US COUNTERPROPOSAL FOR
(D)(3) CONCERNING BURST FREQUENCY MEASURING EQUIPMENT.
THE UK WAS CONCERNED ABOUT EMBARGOING TV BURST FREQUENCY
TESTERS AND SUGGESTED A LOWER FREQUENCY LIMIT OF 100
MHZ. THE AMENDED WORDING IS AS FOLLOWS:"CAPABLE OF

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 OECD P 08708 04 OF 04 081537Z

50

ACTION EB-07

INFO OCT-01 CIAE-00 COME-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00 TRSE-00 EUR-12

ERDA-05 ISO-00 EA-06 ACDA-05 MC-02 /038 W

----- 039138

R 081521Z APR 75

FM USMISSION OECD PARIS

TO SECSTATE WASH DC 6405

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 04 OF 04 OECD PARIS 08708

EXCON

MEASURING BURST FREQUENCIES EXCEEDING 100 MHZ AT
THE INPUT". THE LAST THREE WORDS WERE SUGGESTED BY
FRANCE AND CAUSED THE GERMAN EXPERT TO REMARK "WHERE
ELSE WOULD YOU MAKE A MEASUREMENT BUT AT THE INPUT".
JAPAN, GERMANY AND THE NETHERLANDS ACCEPTED ALL BUT THE
LAST THREE WORDS WHILE ITALY AND CANADA COULD ACCEPT ALL
BUT WERE OPEN-MINDED ABOUT "AT THE INPUT". THE UK AND
US ACCEPTED EITHER VERSION AD. REF.

25. OUR PROPOSAL ON (D)(4) WAS NOT ENTHUSIASTICALLY RE-
CEIVED. MOST DELEGATIONS FELT IT WAS TOO BROAD AND
VAGUE. THE GERMANS SUGGESTED THE ADDITION OF "AL-
LOWING TO SOLVE EQUATIONS WHERE MEASUREMENTS ARE THE
VARIABLES IN (NEAR) REAL TIME". THE NETHERLANDS FELT
SOME REFERENCE TO 1565 WAS APPROPRIATE AND THE UK AGREED
BUT ADDED 1564 MIGHT ALSO BE APPROPRIATE.

26. THE JAPANESE EXPRESSED A RELUCTANCE TO ADD THIS ITEM SINCE IT WOULD EMBARGO SOME OF THEIR COUNTERS WHICH CONTAIN CALCULATORS. FYI-THE COUNTERS THE JAPANESE ARE REFERRING TO APPEAR TO BE THOSE WHICH WE DO WANT TO EMBARGO. THIS ITEM IS IN FOR SOME HEAVY SLEDDING UNLESS SOME APPROPRIATE REDEFINITIONS ARE PRESENTED.

27. OUR PROPOSAL ON SUB-ITEM (C) WAS ACCEPTED (SOME AD. REF.) BY ALL DELEGATIONS WITH THE DELETION OF THE WORDS CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 OECD P 08708 04 OF 04 081537Z

IN PARAENTHESIS. THE US AGREED TO THE DELETION WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THESE TECHNIQUES WERE INCLUDED IN THE DEFINITION.

28. UK PROPOSAL FOR SUB-ITEM (G) WAS ACCEPTED BY ALL DELEGATIONS.

29. THE UK PROPOSAL FOR NOTES 1 THROUGH 4 (REF. F) WAS DISCUSSED BRIEFLY AND VOTED ON. MOST DELS HAD PROBLEMS WITH NOTE 2. NOTE 1, 3 AND 4 WERE ACCEPTED BY ALL DELEGATIONS. BECAUSE OF THE 30 GHZ FREQUENCY LEVEL AND THE FACT THAT THE US WOULD BE UNABLE TO CONSIDER THIS LEVEL EVEN FOR ROUND III, THE US ENTERED AN OBJECTION.

30. ACTION REQUESTED: AS IN SUMMARY.
TURNER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: POLICIES, STRATEGIC TRADE CONTROLS, EXCEPTIONS LIST, MEETING DELEGATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 08 APR 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GarlanWA
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975OECDP08708
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D750121-0882
From: OECD PARIS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750471/aaaacngm.tel
Line Count: 417
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EB
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 8
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 75 COCOM DOC REV(71529/2
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GarlanWA
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 16 JUN 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: WITHDRAWN <14 MAY 2003 by izenbei0, EXCON>; RELEASED <16 JUN 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <16 JUN 2003 by GarlanWA>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: COCOM LIST REVIEW - IL 1529 - INSTRUMENTS
TAGS: ESTC, UK, COCOM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006